

Chair Mortazavi called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm on Tuesday, March 23, 2010, Nelson Hall East, Room 201 (Goodwin Forum). A quorum was present.

Members Present: Altschul, Berman, Bolick-Floss, Cannon, Chapin, Cheyne, Craig, Ellerd, Faulk, Flashman, Fulgham, Goodman, Heise, Knox, Margell, Meiggs, Mola, Mortazavi, Moyer, Nordstrom, Olson, Paynton, Powell, Rodriguez (1st part), Rizzardi, Ryerson-Replogle, Snyder, Tripp, Van Duzer, VerLinden, Yarnall.

Members Absent: Butler, Gunsalus, Richmond.

Proxies: Craig for Reiss, Fulgham for Thobaben, Nathan Rudberg for Rodriguez.

Chair Mortazavi informed the Senate that he has received numerous emails and phone calls from the community in support of the Nursing program. He provided a handout of copies of the emails he has received. He expressed his hope that the meeting will be conducted professionally and asked that everyone respect the rules of the Senate and allow the Senate to conduct its business respectfully.

Proxies were announced.

TIME CERTAIN: 4:00-4:45 pm. – *Senate discussion

Based on a decision previously made by the Senate, the meeting will not be open to participation by guests. Only the senators will participate in the discussion. It was requested that senators speak both for and against the proposals and try to have a balanced discussion.

Discussion:

The nursing students and other guests attending the meeting were acknowledged. It was stated that nobody sitting at the table want to eliminate any program at HSU. The Senate has no good choice to make. Regardless of the outcome, no one is intending to diminish the value of any of the programs under consideration.

Everyone was reminded the senators represent constituencies; they are not voting for themselves, they are voting as representatives of constituencies.

In regard to the two undergraduate packages, good reasons were presented on Saturday for the elimination of Nursing. Reasons included: 1) Senators from the College of Natural Resources and Sciences (CNRS) noted that 5-6 programs from CNRS were up for elimination. These programs were highly rated in the prioritization process, but because of cost they were identified for potential elimination; 2) Senators also considered what they could cut in order to save the most programs; cutting one big programs would save many small programs; and 3) Past problems in Nursing in terms of recruitment and retention of faculty were also considered.

Senators gave the matter a lot of thought. However, opposition to the elimination of Nursing was expressed for the following reasons. The Master Plan for higher education in California says that the CSU's mission is not to graduate students to send to graduate schools. The CSU is supposed to provide mid-level professionals and skilled workers for the California economy. There is no program at HSU or within the CSU that does this more successfully than the Nursing program. There is a demand now both in Humboldt County and in California, and with the recent passage of health care legislation, there will be a huge demand for nurses. The Senate should not turn its back on the CSU mission as defined in the Master Plan. It would be a complete contradiction to its social responsibility to the people of California. It is inappropriate to consider the elimination of the Nursing program.

Senator Flashman yielded the floor to Tory Starr, to speak on behalf of the Nursing program. Chair Mortazavi requested that the remarks be kept to three minutes. The Senate was thanked for allowing input on the difficult process of program reduction, and for the thoughtful and deliberative process it has conducted. Starr, a graduate of the HSU Nursing program, and a part-time lecturer in the Community Health program gave input from the provider side of the health community. Based on his experience, the baccalaureate prepared nurse is uniquely prepared to take on the challenges of an increasingly complex and complicated health care delivery system. HSU Nursing students graduate with a unique set of skills, in particular, critical thinking skills and decision-making abilities. Many HSU graduates go into leadership positions in the health care delivery system. Information is available that shows that well-prepared nursing staffing has a direct impact on positive patient outcomes. St. Joseph's Hospital and the nursing union have acknowledged the need for baccalaureate prepared nurses. It just recently passed a clinical ladder in its recent contract. The ladder provides economic incentives for students to pursue a baccalaureate degree and provides ongoing support for them to continue their education. St. Joseph's has also given direct financial support to the HSU Nursing program for salaries for clinical instructors. Collaborative partnerships have been created to increase services to the community and increase clinical placements for senior-level students. A vibrant HSU nursing program is of vital importance to local health care providers. There is significant governmental and philanthropic support available for nursing education, including stimulus money available through the recent health care legislation. Senators were encouraged to think in the long-term and what the community needs and the State needs. The current economic crisis will pass, the populous believes in education, and any decision will have lasting implications. Re-starting the Nursing program will be almost impossible.

At Saturday's meeting, it was concluded that the only way to make this work was to cut one large program, expensive rather than a lot of smaller ones. Fewer students would be impacted by cutting one large program than eight smaller programs. This is a painful decision, but the decision to cut Nursing is the right one considering the following options of other large programs that could be considered:

- English – cost savings ca. \$500,000, a category 2 program, on the CO list of programs expected at a university, and if chosen, other programs would also have to be cut to reach the target cut
- Engineering – cost savings ca. \$600,000, a category 1 program, would not total the amount needed

- Music – cost savings ca. \$600,000, a category 2 program, on the CO list of programs expected for a university, would have to find another program to cut along with it
- Theatre – cost savings ca. \$600,000, a category 2 program, would have to find another program to cut along with it
- Art – cost savings ca. \$800,000, close to the figure needed, however it has 400 majors and is the 2nd largest program at HSU, it is also a category 2 program, and on the CO list
- Biology – possibly considered one of the major flagship programs of the university – with cost savings of ca. \$500,000, a category 1 program and on the CO list
- Kinesiology – cost savings ca. \$500,000, a category 2 program and connects closely to Athletics which HSU feels is an important recruiting tool

If the Senate has to choose a large program, Nursing is the best choice. Other large programs would involve cutting additional larger programs. The Senate also needs to think about the future mix of programs on campus; it is clear that HSU has been living beyond its means for a long time. Eliminating an expensive program makes that possible.

The interim Dean for the College of Professional Studies was asked several questions about the BRN accreditation process. It there a minimal number of tenure-line faculty required? No – there is not a minimum requirement. There is a desire to have a certain proportion of full-time doctorate trained nurses. Whether or not they are tenure-track is not the issue; it is whether or not they are doctorate trained. A balance is desirable and HSU is low. Is the department required to have a chair? No – accreditation requires having a Director of Nursing. Having a chair is a CSU issue. A Director of Nursing is required to have had at least one year of administrative service as an assistant director or equivalent experience. Why has there been such a high turnover of tenure-track faculty over the past six years? It comes down to an issue of changing personalities in the department and other changes. Why have there been so many failed searches in the past six years? Dean Hurlbut spoke to the current year, for which she has served as dean. A mistake was made in the process, which caused a failure of the search. The director/chair search is still underway.

Opposition to elimination of the Nursing program was stated. The financial future of students is a stake. Professors in other departments have stated that Nursing is beneficial to the university. There is a nursing shortage and it would impact local hospitals. There has been a lack of vetting with the students on the issue.

Chapin yielded the floor to Nursing student Beth Weissbart. There are a number of pre-nursing students that would like the opportunity to get into the program. Hundreds apply to the program every year and only 30 per semester are admitted. The coursework taken for pre-nursing is very specific and it is difficult to change to another major without adding additional years to graduation. This is bigger than just the students who are here in this room. The pre-nursing students deserve to be considered as well.

Chair Mortazavi reminded senators that there are other programs to be considered and voted on, in case there is discussion needed for them as well.

The difference between package 1 and 2 is the inclusion of Computer Science in package 2. Senators were reminded that if Computer Science is kept, at best it will be on probation. It would be reviewed later on if the numbers are not achieved. Keeping it gives the department a chance to prove that it can increase the enrollment.

A number of people have asked if they can be recognized and speak. Clarification was requested regarding having non-senators participate in the meeting. It had been understood that senators would not yield the floor.

There is little to be saved by eliminating Computer Science and there is a great deal of opportunity that would be lost. It should be kept. The Senate can't consider probationary measures at this point.

Everyone who is in the room needs to become expert not only in Nursing, but needs to develop expertise in the diverse functions and mission of HSU in order to weigh the problem that is presented to the Senate – if Nursing is not cut, what will be cut? Everyone needs to become an advocate for HSU to the taxpayers, legislature, and governor of the State of California. Everyone was reminded that several programs have already been cut (German, Athletic Training, Applied Technology, etc.). Everything that is left is valuable; it is difficult to make these choices.

Elaboration was requested on the statement that there is little cost savings from the graduate studies programs in theatre arts. It was surprising to learn on Saturday, after strong and convincing arguments from five graduate programs that essentially little money would be saved by eliminating any of them. The reason is that the graduate students in the programs provide considerable support (teaching undergraduate sections, supervising activities, etc.) for the undergraduate programs. It suggested that even if the Senate went further up the list, other programs would have similar rationales for why cutting the program would not yield a cost savings. It was not the purpose of this process to cut programs that would further compromise other programs. It was noted that the graduate programs in theatre arts did not come into existence through an outside subsidy; they came into existence through the creativity and ingenuity of people in the department. The idea of punishing these programs is unacceptable.

How do graduate programs at HSU fit into the Master Plan? The Plan does not specifically say that the CSU is here to create graduate programs. However, information was presented on Saturday which shows that the work of graduate students enhances the undergraduate experience in the related programs. That is what would speak to the mission of the CSU.

Rodriguez yielded the floor to student Nathan Rudberg. Nursing secures a financial future for students and it is important for students. Nursing is extremely important to the fabric of the future society that students must live in. There has not been the same opportunity for student participation as there was for other programs where students were allowed to give presentations to the Senate. While this couldn't be done for the current process, there should have been more opportunity for student participation.

Computer Science and Computer Information Systems were category 4 programs and submitted a plan to the ICC to combine the two programs. The ICC reviewed the plan and did not find the plan to be compelling as it was submitted. The ICC directed the programs to put together a program committee under the post-prioritization process to respond to a preliminary question of whether or not the program should be eliminated. The process was stopped when the program elimination process began.

It makes no sense to eliminate any of the graduate programs that represented themselves on Saturday because of the consequences to their related undergraduate programs. But one of the programs the Senate is being asked to eliminate doesn't exist – the MA (Film Production) program. The cost savings is calculated on projected future savings. It doesn't make a lot of sense.

The CSU produces a great number of master's degrees, maybe even more than the UC campuses. The Senate did not consider getting rid of all graduate programs before eliminating any undergraduate programs. The Senate is considering a certain number of programs. If the savings needed cannot be reached, then the Senate will go further up the list. On Saturday, the Provost asked the Senate that it provide a good reason for choosing the Nursing program, and not another large program on the list. Nursing is the only program on campus that is impacted; there is a clear demand. It is the one program that the state legislature has identified for special treatment and allocated increased funding for. The Senate needs to be clear as to its arguments. The argument that programs are on the Master Plan list is not a sufficient reason for not considering them; any program can exist without having a major. Programs on the list don't require special permission to provide on campus; the list does not require that campuses have the programs on the list. The Provost stated that he needs to know why this program (Nursing), rather than other programs should be eliminated.

In terms of graduate programs, the point was made previously that programs should be looked at as a package is correct. But it is because the graduate programs don't cost anything; the costs of the graduate programs are subsidizing the undergraduate programs. The cost figures show that many undergraduate courses would be low-enrolled and cancelled without the addition of the enrolled graduate students. Combined classes don't have to meet minimum enrollments for either undergraduate or graduate classes.

It is a complex problem. It is important for the county health program to have access to baccalaureate trained nurses. There is no question that the program makes a huge contribution to the community. Faculty colleagues have requested a vote in favor of eliminating the Nursing program because the impact will affect fewer students and because there is a history that suggests that the program has had ongoing problems. There are reasons for voting both ways and good arguments on both sides. There is no ultimately good answer.

Chair Mortazavi announced that the Senate is reaching its next time certain agenda item and there are six people remaining on the speaker's list.

M/S/U (Van Duzer/Goodman) to suspend the rules and hear the final six speakers before moving on to the next agenda item.

Discussion continued:

The Nursing program should not be on the current list for elimination; though there wouldn't be opposition to including it at a later point in time. It is the department managing the program that is having difficulty (faculty and staff retention, etc.), not the program. It is a staffing problem that has made the Nursing program an easy target for elimination. The program has been fairly successful for its students and the community. Elimination will have an impact on HSU enrollment that is not being adequately measured; not only will the majors be lost, but the pre-majors will be lost. The loss will be felt across many service courses in the sciences.

Rodriguez yielded the floor to the President of the Humboldt-Del Norte County Medical Society, Dr. Hal Grotke. On behalf of his colleagues, he requested that the Nursing program be continued. The State of California is short of nurses and the shortage of nurses is even higher in Humboldt County. The County has difficulty recruiting nurses, doctors, and other medical personnel. Recent changes in federal health care laws will increase the number of people with financial means to access nursing care and the shortage of nurses will become more severe. The nurses who study here tend to stay here. It is harder to recruit people who haven't lived here. The community needs this program.

A Point of Order was raised and people were asked to hold their applause until all speakers were finished, because of the limited time available.

In response to earlier comments, it was noted that the process did not involve looking at graduate and undergraduate programs in a holistic way; they were reviewed separately. If the desire was to do this, then all programs involving both graduate and undergraduate students should have been reviewed and treated the same way. It is unsettling and inappropriate to suggest doing so now for the programs that are on the list for possible elimination.

It was noted that for the graduate program in Theatre Production, the Dean of the College identified 22 WTUs as part of the calculation. Of those, five would not be taught if the program was eliminated. Some would require an altered rotation. One of the courses with a large graduate student enrollment, Grant Writing, is a class that serves the Environment and Community program and most of the students are from that program. The information that was given earlier is misleading and the savings from the program would total less than half of what was indicated.

One of the reasons for proposing to eliminate the Nursing program is that it is expensive. However, the main reason ("the elephant in the room") is the staffing issue. Some are wondering if it is going to die a slow death or a fast death and asking will it be accredited or not. The savings may be more than is indicated, i.e., there will be fewer of some of the more expensive science classes needed. On the other hand, people get jobs in Nursing. If the program was running well and did not have staffing problems, the Senate would probably not be considering cutting it. The issue has been raised – if not Nursing, what other programs would be cut? Other programs in some combination, e.g., TFD, Philosophy, French, Computer

Science, Music, would have to be substituted. It is a difficult choice. When senators vote, they need to be looking up the list and thinking about “either/or”.

No one is acknowledging fully how much of a tragedy the senate is working on here. Not everything that is at stake has been articulated. It needs to be acknowledged that people’s lives will be wrecked, regardless of what the Senate decided. Many lecturers will lose their jobs. The climate on campus will be greatly affected by decisions that are made and the impact on morale will be exacerbated. The department chairs in the College of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences warned some time ago that HSU cannot keep whittling itself away, taking 10% cuts across the board, etc. However, the opinion was expressed that taking a 10% cut across the board would provide the budget reduction needed in Academic Affairs. For departments a 10% cut would be disastrous; skepticism was expressed whether or not this would be true for all departments.

The Provost was asked if the figure given for savings from the Nursing program is close to what would be saved. The Provost responded that it is probably substantially less than what would actually be saved. Everyone was reminded that the cost savings were calculated for every program on campus, and done in a very generalized and stylized way. The figures don’t take into account individual circumstances of departments. In some cases, the cost savings would be less and in some cases it would be more. Currently, HSU has ca. \$1.2 million dollars invested in the Nursing program the year; this is what the expenditures will be.

Voting to eliminate nursing is done with resentment at having to make this choice; but the other choices are even worse. The budgetary savings and the staffing issues and the department’s recent history are reasons for eliminating nursing. The need in the region and community for nurses will probably be affected, but there is some provision for RNs through the College of the Redwoods program and the salary differential between RNs and BSNs is pretty small. It is hoped that the Nursing program will be suspended and brought back when there is a budget to do so. Cutting a lot of small programs would irredeemably alter the mission and ability of HSU to retain its identity.

CAHSS Interim Dean Ayoob was asked to respond to a question on the cost savings figures for the TFD program. What is the impact on the undergraduate program of losing a .25 clerical position and a .5 technical position? If there were no graduate program, faculty would be re-assigned to do technical work that the graduate students were doing. In regard to the clerical position, the paperwork needed for productions would be reduced.

COPS Interim Dean Hurlbut was asked what the conversion rate of pre-Nursing majors to the admitted cohort is. It was responded ca. 30-35%. Information from the department was provided. Each year it gets 600-800 applicants specifically for pre-Nursing. Of those applicants, 150, on average, apply to the Nursing program. Of the program applicants, 30 are accepted each semester, sometimes 20 in the Fall.

How many of the Nursing program graduates, per year, remain employed in Humboldt County? In the last year and a half, St. Joseph’s Hospital hired 24 Nursing students from HSU and 23 are still employed.

In order to provide perspective on the issues under consideration, different scenarios were articulated. If the six undergraduate programs with cost savings below \$100,000 are eliminated, only \$384,784 is generated; the target is \$1.3 million. If the eight programs with cost savings in the range of \$100,000-200,000, \$989,755 would be generated. If the two groups were combined (and no graduate programs included), the target of \$1.3 million would be reached. If the Senate considered graduate programs other than TFD, it would have to look at Psychology and both single subject and multiple subject education. As many have already stated, this is a very unpleasant task. HSU has an enormous budget deficit to deal with and the Senate needs to consider how to do it with the least amount of destruction to HSU.

No one around the table wants to eliminate any program. The Senate has been given the task and is trusting that the numbers are correct and that the need is correct. Some of the remarks that have been made in regard to the Nursing program make a difference on an individual personal level, but they don't make a lot of difference in terms of voting. It is agreed that eliminating the Nursing program will be devastating to students. The problem is that any programs that are eliminated will be devastating to students. If the Senate chooses to eliminate multiple less-expensive programs, more students will be affected. Any programs that are eliminated will result in fewer students coming to HSU. Of less concern is whether or not the department is having trouble internally. However, of concern is that there is a national shortage of nurses, and that is where the faculty is coming from. This suggests that the department will still have a difficult time recruiting appropriate faculty. The biggest issue is that the Nursing program is very expensive. In addition to the cost savings given, the programs cost per FTES is \$10,733, whereas most programs are below \$7,000, and many are less than half that cost per FTES. For every nursing student that goes through the program, students from other programs are essentially subsidizing them. This occurs elsewhere, but it is exacerbated in Nursing by the large number of students and the very high cost. More information about the possible funding sources that have been mentioned (from the new health care bill and grants) would be helpful. It comes down to cost issues, and there seems to be no other remedy, from the CSU or the State.

TIME CERTAIN: 4:45 – Voting on packages of programs proposed for elimination:

Chair Mortazavi reminded senators that if all packages fail, then the Senate will begin at the bottom of the list and vote program by program.

Voting was conducted via response card. Senators were not apprised of the vote for each package until all packages had been voted upon. Results of the voting were announced.

Package 1 (undergraduate): Computer Information Systems (\$135,744) and Nursing (\$867,200) = \$1,002,944:

Voting Results:	Yes – I vote to eliminate	18
	No – I vote to not eliminate	7
	I Abstain	0
	I Recuse Myself	2

Package 2 (undergraduate): Computer Science (\$66,859), Computer Information Systems (\$135,744) and Nursing (\$867,200) = \$1,069,803:

Voting Results:	Yes – I vote to eliminate	10
	No – I vote to not eliminate	16
	I Abstain	0
	I Recuse Myself	2

Package 3 (graduate): MA (Film Production), MFA (Scenography) and MA (Theatre Production) = \$165,722:

Voting Results:	Yes – I vote to eliminate	6
	No – I vote to not eliminate	19
	I Abstain	1
	I Recuse Myself	1

Package 4 (graduate): MA (Film Production) and MFA (Scenography) = not separated out:

Voting Results:	Yes – I vote to eliminate	13
	No – I vote to not eliminate	12
	I Abstain	0
	I Recuse Myself	1

It was asked what happens next. Chair Mortazavi said that the Senate needs to form a rationale for the Provost, to accompany the recommendation to eliminate the programs in package 1 and package 4.

It was clarified again that, despite the wording on the ballot and the continued use of the term “eliminate” in the discussion, the Academic Senate is recommending to suspend the programs, rather than eliminate. The Provost agreed with this.

It was suggested that the vote on the graduate programs was so close (essentially 50/50) that the recommendation to the Provost should include both pro and con arguments.

While the Senate just voted, there is no resolution in front of it that it has approved. Will there be a resolution recommending package 1 and package 4, with rationales attached, provided at the next Senate meeting for the Senate to have a final vote on? It was not clear on what the process would be after the vote was taken. The Senate acts through resolutions and without a resolution, it hasn't taken any action at this point. It was suggested that the Senate would be well-advised to consider a 'Plan B' in case the Chancellor's Office (CO) does not accept the recommendations.

The Senate doesn't deal with “what ifs” and should not do so now. The recommendation will be made to the Provost and the President; it is their business to convince the CO. Unless the Senate wants to have a resolution, Chair Mortazavi stated that he disagrees with the need for a resolution. All that is needed is a rationale.

It was clarified that the maximum number of votes possible was 28 (the number of voting members of the Senate).

The Senate needs to move quickly at this point. It has taken action by voting. Presenting a rationale should be pretty easy to do. It was recommended that the packages be separated and a rationale be provided for package 1 and packages 3 and 4 be left alone. After the Senate's recommendation is forwarded, the ball is in the administration's court. The vote is a pretty clear vote and if the administration does not want to go along with, for whatever reason, it makes it a tough decision for them as it has been for the Senate.

The Provost responded and asked the Senate to think carefully about what it asks him to do.

The Academic Senate has a responsibility and should be accountable for its action and give the Provost as little room as possible to not accept the recommendation.

M/S/F (Flashman/Powell) to accept package 1 for elimination as an action and that the package be returned to the Senate with a rationale for the next meeting.

Discussion:

- What happens if the Senate votes differently on this next week? It needs to be careful about the possibility. It was clarified that the motion doesn't say anything about voting next week.

A point of order was raised and a request was made to hear the motion repeated before voting.

The motion was re-stated: the Senate adopts package #1 and there will be a rationale presented for it at the next Senate meeting at which the Senate will act on the rationale (not on the package).

- It was clarified that the rationale will come from the Senate Executive Committee.
- Does the Senate trust the Senate Executive Committee to write a rationale that is reasonably representative? There doesn't seem to be a great deal of contention about the rationale. It was recommended that this motion be defeated, and that if senators want to have input into the rationale, that the Senate Executive Committee draft a rationale, put it out for comment, and then finalize it and forward to the Provost.
- What does this mean for package 4? It was stated that a different motion would be needed for package 4.
- If this motion passes, does it mean this is coming back to the Senate before it goes forward? Concern was expressed about the timeline. This needs to move as quickly as possible.
- It was clarified that the only thing coming back to the Senate would be the rationale, so the Senate can provide its 'stamp of approval'.

- It was clarified that if the Nursing program is suspended, students currently in the program will have the opportunity to complete their program.
- The next step for the Provost is to have a larger discussion with the community outside of HSU. He stated that he will probably move forward with what he needs to do, independently of what the Senate decides to do at this point, given the timeline.
- It seems that from the Saturday meeting, rationales were already put together in order to form the packages. An additional rationale seems pointless. This needs to move on. There are large issues the Senate needs to address in terms of the whole process.
- Part of the context of the discussion is the consequence of the voting on the German program. There was disagreement between the Senate and Provost. A rationale on paper is needed to everyone can understand the arguments. It is important for everyone to be clear about their reasons, especially if there is disagreement on the recommendation. If everyone agrees, the reasons are less important.
- Is the Provost saying he is moving forward without a rationale from the Senate; or is he going to wait a week for the rationale and then move forward? The Provost stated he felt that he needed to move forward now; the Senate has voted to eliminate Nursing. He is still interested in the rationale, but he needs to move the process forward.
- Several senators have already contributed to a summary of the rationale during this meeting. A rationale should not be the result of waiting until the end when the danger is that the Senate would be looking for a rationalization rather than a rationale.

M/S/P (Van Duzer/Craig) to end debate. Voting occurred and motion **PASSED**.

Voting on the motion occurred and **FAILED** with 9 Yes votes, 14 No votes, and 2 Abstentions.

M/S (Van Duzer/Yarnall) to adjourn the meeting.

Before the meeting adjourned, Chair Mortazavi addressed Provost Snyder. When the Senate began this process in December, the Provost expressed his doubt that the Senate could accomplish the task. Repeatedly, administrators have expressed doubt as well. The Senate has undertaken a painful process and has delivered what it was supposed to. This is not the time for the administration to split from the Senate and take a different position. If this is going to become a political matter between the faculty and the administration, it is hard to know how to interpret that.

The Provost stated that he a good idea of the Senate's reasons for eliminating Nursing, based on what has been stated today. He decision will depend upon whether or not he agrees with the reasons and the rationale. This is not a solidarity matter. This is understandably a difficult decision and the Provost expressed his appreciation for the work the Senate has done.

Voting on the motion to adjourn occurred and **PASSED**. The meeting adjourned at 6 pm.